

"To travel through his appointed district—to take charge of all the elders, deacons, traveling and local preachers, and exhorters in his district—to change, receive, and suspend preachers during the intervals of the conferences, and in the absence of the Bishop—to preside in the absence of the Bishop—to oversee the spiritual and temporal business of the Church in his district—to take care that every part of discipline be enforced in his district." We say it settles the question, because the General Conference of 1834 has by its decision determined the fact, first, that *judiciary power* belongs to the Quarterly Meeting Conference; and secondly, that the terms, "oversee the spiritual and temporal business of the Church," do not mean that they have power to settle "questions of law," apart from the court over which they preside. And with these sentiments, agrees our practice. One case occurs to us, which we ought not to withhold. It was at the Maine Conference of 1835. Bishop Emory was in the chair. Some ten or twenty questions of law came up, from the Quarterly Conference, from industry circuit, for decision. Bishop Emory pronounced them to be *Conference for their decisions*. But to hasten business, the writer of this article, if he recollects rightly, rose and moved that the question be submitted to the chair. It was done, and the decisions of Bishop Emory were given. But his opinions all received the sanction of the conference by vote, and are thus recorded on the journals of the conference, as the opinion, not of the bishop, but of the conference. Moreover, we find more than twenty decisions of a judiciary character, at that single session, by the conference, besides the examination of character. And we venture to say, that there is not an annual conference in the United States, whose journals will not show, that from the beginning they have acted as judiciary bodies on all questions of law. And we confess ourselves utterly surprised that any different view can be entertained, by persons who have attended these bodies for any length of time. Indeed, we think when the *judging power* is taken from the conferences, they are so much less than a cipher, that they need never be used.

But, in conclusion, it may be asked, has not a president of an annual conference any other power over that body, than that which pertains to the office of a president? We answer, cheerfully, he has. He has the power of appointments. But this cannot do more than limit the session of that body to a week. But neither does this control arise from the nature of that office, but from his episcopal character. The bishop has also over the conference a degree of *pastoral authority*. But pastoral power he has every where. But it may be conceded, that when the bishop commands order in a conference, that the command is clothed with more authority than it would be from a mere chairman of an associate body. This would arise from his religious character. His commands, too, would partake of the same characteristics. But this power does not, cannot defeat the ends of private and official judgment upon duties that belong to conference, unless the bishop be the sole head of the church, a position which we hope no man will defend. This would be assuming an authority never claimed, to our knowledge, in an associate body. And it may not be improper to remark, that such power is not conceded to the highest officer in the church of Rome. "The decision of the pope is not considered binding; contrary to the council." We may remark, also, that pastoral power in conference, only extends to order, and what may be claimed from religious character, but not to power over the judgment. The bishop may rule a conference by *love*, and the wisdom and weight of his counsels; but obligation to obey in conference applies to the duties of religion, rather than to opinions on official judgments, as these are all settled, in Methodism, in *associate bodies*; and it must be so, so long as the right of private judgment is allowed. When this is taken away, we need not tell what follows.

*See discussion between Pope and Maguire, Dublin, 1827.

Revivals.

FOR ZION'S HERALD.

SOUTH COVENTRY, CONN.
MR. EDITOR—I feel grateful to the God of Israel, for the work he has wrought among his people on this circuit. Since I last wrote to you, the work has still been progressing to the glory of God. Not far from 30, we trust, are reconciled to him.

It may be pleasing to some who have been acquainted with the condition of the *Methodists* in South Coventry, to know more of the particulars relative to this revival. I will therefore give them a passing notice.

We have had indications of a revival frequently during the present year at this appointment, but they would shortly disappear, and the feelings of the people to appearance, were more indifferent. But more particularly was there an indication of a revival under the labors of a colored preacher; and had it not been for his black skin, without doubt a number would have presented themselves for the prayers of God's people. He held a number of meetings in this place, which greatly disturbed some in the neighborhood, and forthwith a meeting was called, which voted, that there should be no meeting in that school-house. We do not say that there was a determination to get rid of the families who were Methodists in that Factory Village, but we say they have no employ, and are about to move. In glory to the God of Israel, he is multiplying the number.

It is reported that the preaching of the colored brother has disgraced this place; but we ask, wherein does it consist? Did he not preach the gospel? Was he not highly esteemed, and was it not confirmed by a crowded house? Was not his behaviour and appearance with decorum? Did he not, in his visits among the people, clearly indicate that God was with him? And did not the signs of some speak this language? Where, then, is the disgrace of this neighborhood? Does it not consist in the course which they took to close the door against him?

Our revival did not commence in the neighborhood of this transaction, but we moved to another place, about three miles distant, where it commenced. But are happy to say, that from it, sparks have flown to this village, which are now shining. We hope that God will spread that kind of religion in the place, which has no respect to the color of the skin.

In Williamite times remain still in a chaotic state. The opposition to abolitionism, the past year, has, in our opinion, ruined the church. All I have to say is, O Lord, forgive those who are guilty of disturbing the peace of this church.

I wish to say to my friends, through the columns of your paper, that the state of my health is such, that I am unable to pursue my usual labors on this circuit, but shall preach when my health will permit.

S. LEONARD.

Williamite, Conn., March 5, 1838.

FOR ZION'S HERALD.

DURHAM, N. H.
MR. BROWN—I will undoubtedly be gratifying to your numerous readers to know, that the work of God is still progressing in these regions. A protracted meeting has been held in Durham, N. H., which has resulted in much good, and which was attended with many pleasing circumstances. As there were very few Methodists in the place, the prospect of doing good by the exclusive efforts of brethren, was not very flattering. To remedy this deficiency, our Congregationalist brethren joined in the effort, heart and hand; and the result has been such as might be expected, when the hosts of Israel all have a mind to work without distinction of party. I believe the only vendor of ardent spirit in the place is among the number converted. He is a

gentleman of respectable standing, and will undoubtedly abandon his business, which he has been contemplating doing for some time. The number of Universalists who have been forward for prayers in this region is great. One case I will mention, which clearly shows the legitimate influence of Universalism. It relates to a gentleman who had been long under the influence of that doctrine; who, when he was inquired of why he did not attend the Universalist meeting house as usual, replied, that he hoped he had found a better way; that he felt that he was saved from habit of intemperance which had well nigh proved his ruin. In this part of the conversation, or previous to this reply, he was sharply rebuked for having pursued such habits of dissipation; to which he very modestly said, he knew it was wrong, and that he deserved the rebukes; but that while he was pursuing the road to destruction, he had supposed that Universalism was true, and that he was in no danger.

BRYAN MORSE.

February 28, 1838.

FOR ZION'S HERALD.

EXETER, N. H.

MR. BROWN—We desire to acknowledge with gratitude to God, his great mercy to us in a revival of his work in this place. We cannot speak of those extraordinary displays of divine power and grace with which our more favored brethren in some other places are blessed, but, considering our means and circumstances, we feel that we are greatly indebted to God. The revival has been gradual, and has resulted in the admission of 40 persons on probation. In addition to those awakened and converted, the church has been quickened and blessed.

We have in this place, a substantial brick house, but embarrassed with many debts. I hope the time has come when our people will no more attempt to build without first counting the cost, and ascertaining whether they are able. Our means are small in most respects, but we confidently expect success; because, though few and weak, we are united.

Our congregations, though not so large in the number who attend as in some larger towns and cities where I have been, yet, they are behind none in propriety and deportment in the place of worship; and behind few, if any, in a disposition to support, according to their means, the institutions of religion. There is much to render this an agreeable station; and when we shall have surmounted our temporal embarrassments, as we expect to, and gained the standing which we anticipate, it will be truly so.

J. SANBORN.

Exeter, N. H., March 6, 1838.

FOR ZION'S HERALD.

MANCHESTER, N. H.

MR. BROWN—The Lord visited us on this station in mercy. For a number of weeks past the church has been coming up to the help of the Lord against the mighty, and we thought it advisable to make some extra exertions for the promotion of the work. We accordingly appointed a protracted meeting, to commence Feb. 6, which was preceded by a day of fasting and prayer. The Lord heard and answered; the work preached took effect; and sinners were awakened and happily converted to God. There has been as many as 40 forward for prayers at a time, between 15 and 20 have been converted, some backsliders have been reclaimed, and the work still continues to go on. The church is generally well in the work, and we are praying and hoping for a more glorious display of divine power. To God be all the glory.

C. L. McCURDY.

March 8, 1838.

FOR ZION'S HERALD.

EAST WILLIAMSTOWN CIRCUIT, N. H. CONF.
MR. BROWN—The Lord has been pleased, in the plenitude of his mercy, to visit this circuit, with the outpourings of his Holy Spirit. Some 50 or 60 souls have passed, as we trust, from darkness to light, and from the power of Satan unto God. This work is principally among the youth, though not exclusively, and has been accomplished mostly by means of protracted meetings, of which we have held two. The first was held in Williamstown, and the second in Brookfield.

We are indebted to several of our brethren in the ministry for assistance at these meetings, especially to the Rev. John Perrin, of the Maine Conference, who now resides at Brookfield, and was with us, and superintended the meeting at that place. As I was necessarily absent most of the time, but while we would be grateful for human help, we would be especially thankful for the divine blessing.

J. A. SCARRETT.

March 3, 1838.

FOR ZION'S HERALD.

HARTLAND, VT.

The Lord is with us, the God of Jacob is our refuge. Backsliders are reclaimed, and sinners converted to God. While it is well with us and ours, we do not forget to pray for the poor down-trodden slave in his afflictive, nor their oppressors.

W. PECK.

FOR ZION'S HERALD.

AN EXCURSION OF PLEASURE.

MR. BROWN—Since at all seasons of the year much anxiety is manifested for "parties of pleasure," it may be very proper to throw out hints with respect to the best mode of conducting them. No farther apology will be deemed necessary, we presume, for noticing briefly a visit to Weston, yesterday, by some thirty of us, including the pastor and some lay members, each of the M. E. Churches in this city. Ignorant of the number of the brethren who had formerly resided in that village, and had been connected several years with the church in that place. We had indeed anticipated pleasure, but it was by no means of that kind of which a smiling sky and enchanting scenery are essential elements; and hence, although the weather was auspicious, we found no occasion to defer our visit.

At an early hour in the afternoon, we stopped at the house of worship, where we were met by some of the brethren of the place. We immediately engaged in the exercises of religious worship, and the pastor of the Bromfield St. Church discoursed to us very happily on that "love which worketh no ill to its neighbors." Then followed what may be not unfrequently termed an extemporaneous "love-feast." All were invited to declare what they knew and felt of holy influences, and very few were speechless;—those few from necessity, perhaps, for the time was short. Each one seemed to be conscious of hallowing motives in this withdrawing from the din and bustle of the city, to sympathize with and encourage the few band of disciples of Christ in Weston. Some might have felt at first a little disappointment, but it was only for a moment, and soon the universal sentiment seemed to be, "all is well," and "it is good for us to be here."

The circumstances, the persons present, the place, all seemed to awaken some dear remembrances and associations. One found it delightful to be there, for it was in the country that she first found, by blissful experience, that the God of nature is also the God of that grace which bringeth salvation. In the venerable and care-worn minister whom we were visiting one of our beloved pastors recognized the insurmountable his own father's conversion. Another of our number claimed the spot where we were assembled, as his spiritual birthplace; the church itself as his spiritual mother.—This brother will excuse me, I believe, if I record, as nearly as I can recollect, in his own words, a circumstance which happily illustrates the blessedness of Christian effort.

"One evening, when there was a prayer meeting

at my house, the village inn yonder, a gentleman from the city happened to put up with me for the night. Though an entire stranger, I felt that I ought to invite him into the room where prayer was to be made, and he assented. A few years afterwards I removed to the city, and was one day accosted in the street by a gentleman whom I did not immediately recognize, but was soon reminded that it was he whom I had introduced to the prayer meeting.—"That," he said, "was the first Methodist meeting I ever attended; but I was so favorably impressed, that, upon my return home, I persuaded my wife to go with me to one of your places of worship, when it pleased God to awaken and convert us both; and now we claim you as our brother in church fellowship."

The exercises of the evening were not less interesting and delightful, than those of the afternoon had been. We listened to a very appropriate discourse on "the blessedness of the man who maketh the Lord his trust," by the pastor of the Blossom Street Church, and to several exhortations from other brethren in the ministry. Few were present beside our own party, and a portion of the church in Weston; and to those who walk by sight, every thing looked unimpressive. Still an irrepressible desire was felt to see even, as the harbinger of a revival in the place, "run before," like him of olden time who wished to see Jesus. "The call was given, and while we were in hope, believing against hope," imagine with what emotions we heard that one, a young man, came forward with resolute step, and in humble penitence knelt at the altar. We thought of the joy in the presence of the angels of God over one sinner that repenteth, and we felt that we were permitted to be partakers of that joy. We know not that he has yet rejoiced in the peace of believing, but we can hope that a work has been begun in his own heart and in Weston, which shall be consummated in glory.

At the close of our meeting we solemnly pledged ourselves to remember Weston in prayer, and this pledge was reciprocated by the brethren of the place. May Heaven bless them.

Boston, March 8, 1838.

FOR ZION'S HERALD.

"LAY MEMBERS."

MR. BROWN—I wish to say to your readers, that in a short notice in reply to Dr. Snow, published in the Herald of Feb. 28, not the least disrespect was intended to be shown to our "lay members." All who know me, know that I respect their rights, as much as I do those of the clergy.

It is well known that I advocate the doctrine of equal rights, and that I am opposed to *popery* in all its forms.

The notion that our lay brethren are inferior to the clergy, is a sentiment which I heartily disapprove, and I am happy to know that it has no existence on our side of the house.

I make these remarks, because it has been hinted that I might be misunderstood, and perhaps misrepresented.

O. SCOTT.

March 10, 1838.

FOR ZION'S HERALD.

SUFFERINGS OF A HINDOO DEVOTEE.

A missionary thus describes a singular case of self-torture. The devotee was in the act of measuring his way to Juggernaut by his own body. He never rose upon his feet in travelling. When on his knees, he reached his hands forward to the ground, and thus his body onward. Every time he drew himself along, he beat his forehead against the ground three times, looking toward the temple, which was now in sight.

"I felt sufficiently near," said the missionary, "I could not to him, but he did not appear to hear what I said, and continued on his way without paying the least attention. I therefore came up, and succeeded in stopping him. A deep melancholy sat visible upon his countenance, his lips moving in prayer to his god, in a low grumbling tone of voice. I had never heard him say a few moments, he began over and over again, and I began to converse with him, as well as I was able. I first inquired of him how far he had come in that manner. He answered, 'Seven hundred and fifty miles.' 'How long have you been on the way?' 'About eight months.' He appeared about twenty-one years of age, and was so emaciated that his voice was nearly gone. I could but just understand him. I asked him what he expected from his visit to Juggernaut. He was told that he should get rid of his sins, and that if he would only believe on Christ, he would immediately find the blessings he sought. He seemed to hear with some attention and surprise. By this time a number of wicked looking Brahmins, from a neighboring temple, were gathered around us, and began to encourage him to proceed."

Burder's Missionary Anecdotes.

FOR ZION'S HERALD.

EARLY METHODISTS OF ILLINOIS.—The gospel of Christ by preaching was first introduced into Illinois, about 1787, by Elder James Smith, a Baptist preacher from Kentucky. His labors were blessed and a number were converted, among whom were Capt. Joseph Ogle, Peter Custerline, Benjamin Ogle, William Murray, with several females and others, who adopted the Methodist views of doctrine, church government, &c.

In 1796, Hosea Riggs, a Methodist exhorter, from Western Pennsylvania, came to Illinois, and formed the above named persons into a class. Mr. Riggs was a revolutionary soldier, became converted and joined the Methodists, when 22 years of age. He still lives in St. Clair county, nearly 80 years old, and quite superannuated. He has been a preacher upwards of half a century. This class was formed by the preaching of Joseph Ogle, in the American Bottom, now in Monroe county. The next class was organized in Goshen settlement—as the settlement along the bluffs from Canteen creek was called.—Riggs went to the District Conference in Kentucky in 1803, to obtain Methodist preachers for Illinois.

Including Wisconsin and some mission stations amongst the Indians of the Upper Mississippi, the Methodist numbers amount to about 18,000. The Methodist denomination are occupying broad ground on the subject of education in all its departments, from the primary school up to the classical seminary and ministry.—Pioneer.

FOR ZION'S HERALD.

FREE INQUIRY.—This is the boast alike of those who cast away the whole or a part of the Bible. A young convert came to us the other day in deep distress, because of the persecutions she suffered from her husband. He was taking every means to hinder her from going to the church, where her soul had found peace and joy, and not unfrequently had turned the key of his house against her, when she returned from worshipping God. The Bible he had cast into the flames, and refused to have it replaced. He had been a Universalist, but is now an infidel or follower of Abner Kneeland. The next day, a member of the church came to us with tears and a broken heart, and said, "I was told, by a young man, that I could desire, but one thing. My husband, my poor husband! This day, at the dinner table, he gave me my choice, either to quit your church, or to quit him." "Is your husband an infidel?" we asked. "He was; but lately, he is loud in the praise of the Universalists. If I would go to the church of Mr. S. (a Universalist preacher) he would be satisfied." And still, the next day, our prayers were asked for a young convert, who is expected to join the church, in a few days, who had in like manner been threatened with desertion by her infidel husband, if she persisted in her purpose! We have the names and residences of the three husbands.

And this is free inquiry, indeed! And this is what we are to expect, if these kindred spirits, Universalism and infidelity, should triumph!—N. Y. Zen.

ZION'S HERALD.

BOSTON, WEDNESDAY, MARCH 14, 1838.

THE ALTON AFFAIR.

In the Herald of Feb. 21, we inserted a long article from the *New York Commercial Advertiser* relative to the murder at Alton, and relative to Mr. Lovejoy, and expressed, in connection with that article, our dissent from the writer's position and statements, presented as facts. We wish now to call the attention of our readers to some statements made in that communication which need correcting.

In the first place, I have seen the death of Mr. Lovejoy noticed in a number of abolition papers in glowing colors, and with all the characteristics of holy martyrdom, but in none have I seen a single intimation that there could be even the suspicion of wrong on his part.

No less than eight abolition papers have noticed Mr. Lovejoy's death, with not only intimations or suspicions of wrong on his part, but in unequivocal, and some of them strong terms of disapprobation. The Liberator has been very severe, and some anti-slavery societies have passed resolutions censuring him for taking a deadly weapon into his hands, and for not adhering to the principle of non-resistance. *Honestus* we presume, must live in some obscure village, or he would have known some thing about this.

On the contrary, he has been extolled, eulogized, and almost apotheosized. The orator at the Tabernacle compared his martyrdom to that of St. Stephen; nay he declared that he died a "ricarious sacrifice!"—pushing the comparison so far, as to compare his death to the great sacrifice on Calvary!

The orator here spoken of, is Rev. Beriah Green, of Whitesborough, N. Y., President of the Oneida Institute. If *Honestus* has read this comparison and declaration in that discourse, or if he heard it delivered, there can be no room to doubt his statement. We have sent to New York for a copy of the discourse, so that the truth or falsity of this charge, will soon be decided.

"The language of all this," of the public, is, that Mr. Lovejoy has done right;—their *unqualified approval* of his course, and their high eulogium, show that they not only do not condemn, but that they highly commend his course. This, I say, is to me alarming."

This reasoning would answer very well, and would be very forcible, if it were deduced from facts; but we have seen above, that it is not. The writer says that *his silence and unqualified approval* of Mr. Lovejoy's course, meaning the abolitionists, are to him alarming. But the truth is, they have been silent, not have they given him their *unqualified approval*. But even then, these charges true, are they more faulty than his upholders, who can see nothing in his character to approve, but only to censure? While they charge others with being one-sided, let them be careful that they do not fall into the same error themselves.

"They approve of a Christian and a Christian minister's arming himself and his associates, and shooting down his fellow men."

How unjust and heartless the charge, contained in these few words. Respecting their approval of Mr. Lovejoy's course, we have already said sufficient. The phrase "arming himself and his associates," looks as if the writer intended to convey the idea, that Mr. Lovejoy was the principal agent in this business, and that he actually procured arms and put them into the hands of his friends. But this is not the fact. The writer offers no proof of this. We declare that he neither armed himself or his associates; but that he was acting under the authority of the Mayor of the city. The following is the statement of Rev. Mr. Graves, a Presbyterian clergyman of Alton. "We extract it from a letter written by him to the editor of the *New York Observer*."

"The history of the matter is this: A few days previous to the suggestion of the Mayor, a volunteer company of some 50 or 60 men was got up, and organized, to act in any emergency under the civil authorities, for the preservation of peace in the city. About 50 of this company spent the evening of the 24th, in the regular military exercises in the same building in which the press was deposited. About nine o'clock, they dispersed, leaving only twelve men, who were in the opinion of the whole company, amply sufficient, to defend the press against any attack, that a mob could bring against them. The Mayor was consulted, and all their plans arranged and directed with his approbation."

Mr. Gilman, one of the owners of the building in which the press was stored, says in one of his communications, "I assured them that we would not deliver it [the press]—that we had been told by the Mayor to protect our property, and that we would do so with our lives."

The *Alton Telegraph* of Jan. 24th, which gives an account of the trial of the rioters, states, that it was made to appear by evidence, that there was an agreement among those in the building, not to resort to fire-arms, unless driven to it in the preservation of their lives; and that they all supposed they were acting under the authority of the Mayor.

In addition to this, Mr. Owen Lovejoy, brother of the deceased, in a letter to the editor of the *Emancipator*, and published in that paper of Jan. 11, says,

"On the night of the 7th of November, the Mayor went into the building, and was asked by those within if they were right in defending their property and lives. He said, 'yes, perfectly right, the law sanctions and justifies you so doing.'"

So much for a Christian minister's "arming himself and his associates," and now what proof is there that he shot down his fellow man? Does *Honestus* charge a Christian minister with murder and yet offer no evidence of it?

How could he do this in the face of the frequent declarations which have been made in Anti-Slavery papers, that Mr. Lovejoy did not fire at all—that he was not in the room, whence the fire proceeded? This declaration has been made by the surviving company; and who but they could know whether Mr. Lovejoy fired, or not? Could those outside know anything about this, especially as the season was that of night? A young man, one of Mr. Lovejoy's printers, says,

"It is a fact that at least two guns were fired into the building, before any gun was fired from it. A consultation was then held by a portion of the persons inside, and it was determined to fire upon the mob. Accordingly two or three guns were fired at the same time. Which of them took effect is unknown, but the assailed party saw that a wounded man was taken away by his confederates. MR. LOVEJOY WAS NOT IN THE CHAMBER, FROM WHICH THE GUNS WERE FIRED UPON THE MOB."

Honestus says—
"The course Mr. L. pursued, is calculated very obviously to give character and currency to the mob principle."

Then all attempts to quell mobs and to defend just rights, in an official and authorized way, are "calculated very obviously to give character and currency to the mob principle."

But what was the case of Mr. Lovejoy? It does not appear that he ever made any attempt to defend himself by the law. Did he prosecute the rioters when his former presses were destroyed?

Well, suppose he did not make "any attempt to defend himself by law." Is this to be brought against him as a charge? Have not some good men in all ages, suffered persecution and abuse, who did not go to law about it, while others have? The destruction of his press, the white time, was in consequence of his publishing an account of the dedication of the Roman Catholic Cathedral at St. Louis, at which companies of soldiers marched into the house of the Sabbath, with life and drum, and cannons were discharged! He did not prosecute at this time,

but published an appeal to the citizens, which was successful, and he was protected. Suppose he had prosecuted in either of these cases, does *Honestus* believe he would have obtained a verdict? Does he not know that it is very difficult to convict in the case of rioters? Look at the late trial of the Alton rioters, every one of whom was cleared.

"Did he in the present case, apply for a legal defence? Or did he not rather deliberately arm himself and his friends, and take the defence of his rights into his own hands? It was a case, too, not of sudden and unexpected assault, but one in which he had ample time to make his arrangements, and obtain legal protection, if that was necessary and possible; if not necessary, then there was no need of his arming himself and friends;—in doing so, he only held out a kind of challenge, which of itself, in an excited state of the public mind, was calculated to gather a mob and provoke an attack. It was necessary, and could have been obtained, then, to take another course, and assume the defence without a legal provision, was to make private judgment and the will of the party interested, the rule of action, in a case where the exigency did not require it; and this is a very essence of the mob principle. Now, as before stated, it does not appear, either from the Mayor's account, or from any other quarter, that such application was made, and therefore Mr. L. has no right to assume that such aid would not be afforded him."

He did in the present case apply for a legal defence, many times. Where was the writer, then, that he had not seen this declaration repeatedly made? Hear what Owen Lovejoy says on this point, in the letter before mentioned.

"I see in the last Evangelist a remark expressing a great that my brother had not made a formal demand of the Mayor for protection of life and property, before any of the individual efforts were made for that purpose. But, my dear sir, not only did my brother, but our citizens, so, men too who were not abolitionists, make such application once and again and again, and were put off with promises, which were never kept. On Monday the 24th, on the night of which the press arrived, Mr. Gilman and my brother went to the Mayor, and requested the expected arrival of the press, and the threats of violence, and requested that special constables might be appointed, which request was laid before the Common Council in their action, and the only response that it received was that they would do so, but that they would not do so until they had not to bring any abolition press to Alton! and all this prevented it from passing, and being recorded on the books, was the refusal of the Mayor to sign it, he refusing to do so, and saying that it was not an answer to the request before them! This I have from the Mayor himself, and of course it can be depended upon as true."

The reader will perceive, that the fine reasoning in the extract above, is wholly based upon false assumption, and therefore, comes tumbling to the ground.

"The course of Mr. Lovejoy and his friends, whether they be his immediate coadjutors, or his unqualified assistants, is contributing, in my opinion, to the fostering of the very spirit and principles which they so justly condemn. If, then, we would put down mobs, we must disprove of Mr. L.'s course."

So the writer might say with regard to every mob made by physical force to acquire independence, or to defend rights. If Washington, in the American Revolution had been unsuccessful, and had been taken by the British, and hence as a rebel, this writer might with the same propriety have said, "If the British had not rebelled, we must disapprove of Gen. Washington's course." The writer might also adduce the case of Weyley and Whitefield with the same propriety. It was very common thing for these ministers to be mobbed, and these mobs were encouraged by men who very graciously admitted that mobs were bad things, but in the same breath, denounced in bitter terms, these men of God, as disorganizers, and warned the community, that if they would put down mobs, they must disapprove of Mr. Weyley's and Mr. Whitefield's course.

"It may not be pleaded to avoid this, that he was a citizen, and defending his political rights. Christ says, 'My kingdom is not of this world; if my kingdom were of this world, then would my servants fight, but I should not have delivered to the Jews.' Did Mr. L. think with his master? It seems not. If this was a question of political and constitutional rights, why was a minister of the Gospel, in the prosecution of his high vocation, engaged in it?"

Why do ministers of the gospel go as chaplains in the army and navy? Although they do not bear arms, yet what is the difference? They aid, countenance and shelter, and even pray that those who do bear them, may be successful in shooting down their fellow-men, and sending them suddenly into the presence of their Maker! What is the difference? Is it any nearer right for twenty men to fight, than two men? Beside, if it is right to fight all Christians, of all men are the most suitable for it. We regret that Mr. Lovejoy ever took a musket into his hands; but if ever any one had a right to do it, he had, under the circumstances in which he was placed, and if ever a man could be justified in so doing, he can be.

"Did the Apostle Peter, or Paul, or John ever defend themselves against a mob, by deadly weapons?"

What does *Honestus* think of Paul's journey from Jerusalem to Caesarea, under escort of two hundred soldiers, seventy horsemen, and two hundred spearmen? If Paul had conscientiously scruples about their being employed with deadly weapons in their hands, to defend his person, why did he not decline going with them? Suppose on their way, the mob of forty men who had taken an oath that they would neither eat or drink till they had killed Paul, had intercepted them, joined by many others who were nearly as hostile, but who had not taken the oath, and had given the company fight? Could Paul have been justified in joining his spearmen in defending his own life? Suppose the captain of this company of two hundred soldiers, seventy horsemen, and two hundred spearmen, had authorized, and even commanded Paul to take a deadly weapon into his hands, and assist in defending his own life; would it have been right to have done it, or should he say, "No, it is right for you to defend my life by deadly weapons, but it is not right for me to do it."

"I have written the above as though Mr. Lovejoy was the moving and controlling agent in this affair, and as if he had understood his duty, and as if he had been informed, as he has been intimated, those advisers were, or more of them, Christian ministers, it only shows that this course is the more alarming, because it has an extended ministerial patronage. Besides, Mr. L.'s mob course shows that his was the spirit for such an attempt."

That is, his spirit was that of a murderer. This is fully deducible from the language, for the writer has charged him repeatedly with unlawfully shooting down his fellow-men! What a hostile spirit toward a departed brother, whose character is represented by those who knew him, as one of great purity, and of deep piety. A gentleman from Northampton, who addresses a letter to Dr. Channing, through the Hampshire Republican says, "

"To travel through his appointed district—to take charge of all the elders, deacons, visiting and local preachers, and exhorters in his district—to change, receive, and suspend preachers during the intervals of the conferences, and in the absence of the Bishop—to reside in the conferences in the absence of the Bishop—to oversee the spiritual and temporal business of the Church in his district—to take care that every part of discipline be enforced in his district." We say it settles the question, because the General Conference of 1834 has by its decision determined the fact, first, that *judicial power* belongs to the Quarterly Meeting Conferences; and secondly, that the terms, "oversee the spiritual and temporal business of the Church," do not mean that they have power to settle "questions of law, apart from the court over which they preside." And with these sentiments, agrees our practice. The case occurs in us, which we ought not to withhold. It was at the Maine Conference of 1835. Bishop Emory was in the chair. Some ten or twenty questions of law came up, from the Quarterly Conference, from Industry circuit, for decision. Bishop Emory proposed them to the Conference for their decision. But to hasten business, the writer of this article, if he recollects rightly, rose and moved that the question be referred to the chair. It was done, and the decisions of Bishop Emory were given. But his opinions all received the sanction of the conference by vote, and are thus recorded on the journals of the conference, as the opinion, not of the bishop, but of the conference. Moreover, we find more than twenty decisions of a judicial character, at that single session, by the conference, besides the examination of character. And you venture to say, that there is not an annual conference in the United States, whose journals will not show, that from the beginning they have acted as *judicial bodies* on all questions of law. And we confess ourselves utterly surprised that any different view can be entertained, by persons who have attended these bodies for any length of time. Indeed, we think when the *judging power* is taken from the conferences, they are so much less than a cipher, that they need never be used.

But, in conclusion, if we may be asked, has not a president of an annual conference any other power over that body, than that which pertains to the office of a president? We answer, cheerfully, he has. He has the power of appointments. But this control does not arise from his office as president. He may also limit the session of that body to a week. But neither does this control arise from the nature of that office, but from his episcopal character. The bishop has also over the conference a degree of *pastoral authority*. But pastoral power he has every where. But it may be conceded, that when the bishop commands order in a conference, that the command is clothed with more authority than it would be from a mere chairman of an associate body. This would arise from his religious character. His councils, too, would partake of the same characteristics. But this power does not, cannot defeat the ends of private and official judgment upon duties that belong to conference, unless the bishop be the sole head of the church, a position which we hope no man will defend. This would be assuming an authority never claimed, to our knowledge, in an associate body. And it may not be improper to remark, that such a power is not conceded to the highest officer in the church of Rome. The decision of the pope is not considered binding, if contrary to the council.* We may remark, also, that pastoral power in conference, only extends to order, and what may be claimed from religious character, but not to power over the judgment. The bishop may rule a conference by love, and the wisdom and weight of his councils, but he is obliged to obey in conference applies to the duties of religion, rather than to opinions on official judgments, as these are all settled, in Methodism, in associate bodies, and it must be thus, so long as the right of private judgment is allowed. When this is taken away, we need not tell what follows.

*See discussion between Pope and Maguire, Dublin, 1827.

Reviews.

FOR ZION'S HERALD.

SOUTH COVENTRY, CONN.

MR. EDITOR—I feel grateful to the God of Israel, for the work he has wrought among his people on this circuit. Since I last wrote to you, the work has been progressing to the glory of God. Not far from 30, we trust, are reconciled to him.

It may be pleasing to some who have been acquainted with the condition of the *Methuists* in South Coventry, to know more of the particulars relative to this revival. I will therefore give them a passing notice.

We have had indications of a revival frequently during the present year at this appointment, but they would shortly disappear, and the feelings of the people to appearance, were more indifferent. But more particularly was there an indication of a revival under the labors of a colored preacher; and had it not been for his *black sin*, without doubt a number would have presented themselves for the prayers of God's people. He held a number of meetings in this place, which greatly disturbed some in the neighborhood, and forthwith a meeting was called, which voted, that there should be no meeting in that school-house. We do not say that there was a determination to get rid of the families who were Methodists in that Factory Village, but we say they have no employ, and are about to move. But glory to the God of Israel, he is multiplying the number.

It is reported that the preaching of the colored brother has disgraced this place; but we ask, wherein does it consist? Did he not preach the gospel? Was he not highly *calend*, and was it not confirmed by a crowded house? Was not his behaviour and appearance with decorum? Did he not, in his visits among the people, clearly indicate that God was with him? And did not the tears of some speak this language? Where, then, is the disgrace of this neighborhood? Does it not consist in the course which they took to close the door against him?

Our revival did not commence in the neighborhood of this transaction, but we moved to another place, about three miles distant, where it commenced. But are happy to say, that from it, sparks have flown to this village, which are now shining. We hope that God will spread that kind of religion in the place, which has no respect to the color of the skin.

In Williamite things remain still in a chaotic state. The opposition to abolitionism, the past year, has, in our opinion, ruined the church. All I have to say is O Lord, forgive those who are guilty of disturbing the peace of this church.

I wish to say to my friends, through the columns of your paper, that the state of my health is such, that I am unable to pursue my usual labors on this circuit, but shall preach when my health will permit.

S. LEONARD.

Williamite, Conn., March 5, 1838.

FOR ZION'S HERALD.

DURHAM, N. H.

MR. BROWN—I will undoubtedly be gratifying to your numerous readers to know, that the work of God is still progressing in these regions. A protracted meeting has been held in Durham, N. H., which has resulted in much good, and which was attended with many pleasing circumstances. As there were very few Methodists in the place, the prospect of doing good by the exclusive efforts of our brethren, was very flattering. To remedy this deficiency, our Congregationalist brethren joined in the effort, heart and hand; and the result has been such as might be expected, when the hosts of Israel have a mind to work without distinction of party. I believe the only venter of ardent spirit in the place is among the number converted. He is a

gentleman of respectable standing, and will undoubtedly abandon his business, which has been contemplating doing for some time. The number of Universalists who have been forward for prayers in this region is great. One case I will mention, which clearly shows the legitimate influence of Universalism. It relates to a gentleman who had been long under the influence of that doctrine; who, when he was inquired of why he did not attend the Universalist meeting house as usual, replied, that he hoped he had found a better way; that he felt that he was saved from habit of intemperance which had well nigh proved his ruin. In this part of the conversation, or previous to this reply, he was sharply rebuked for having pursued such habits of dissipation; to which he very modestly said, he knew it was wrong, and that he deserved the rebuke; but that while he was pursuing the road to destruction, he had supposed that Universalism was true, and that he was in no danger.

February 28, 1838.

FOR ZION'S HERALD.

EXETER, N. H.

MR. BROWN—We desire to acknowledge with gratitude to God, his great mercy to us in a revival of his work in this place. We cannot speak of those extraordinary displays of divine power and grace with which our more favored brethren in some other places are blessed, but, considering our means and circumstances, we feel that we are greatly indebted to God. The revival has been gradual, and has resulted in the admission of 40 persons on probation. In addition to those awakened and converted, the church has been quickened and blessed.

We have in this place, a substantial brick house, but embarrassed with a heavy debt. I hope the time has come when our people will no more attempt to build without first counting the cost, and ascertaining whether they are able. Our means are small in most respects, but we confidently expect success; because, though few and weak, we are united.

Our congregations, though not so large in the number who attend as in some larger towns and cities where I have been, yet, they are behind none in propriety and deportment in the place of worship; and behind few, if any, in a disposition to support, according to their means, the institutions of religion. There is much to render this an agreeable station; and when we shall have surmounted our temporal embarrassments, as we expect to, and gained the standing which we anticipate, it will be truly so.

Exeter, N. H., March 6, 1838.

FOR ZION'S HERALD.

MANCHESTER, N. H.

MR. BROWN—The Lord visited us on this station in mercy. For a number of weeks past the church has been coming up to the help of the Lord against the mighty, and we thought it advisable to make some extra exertions for the promotion of the work. We accordingly appointed a protracted meeting, to commence Feb. 6, which was preceded by a day of fasting and prayer. The Lord heard and answered; the word preached took effect; and sinners were awakened and happily converted to God. There has been as many as 40 forward for prayers at a time, between 15 and 20 have been converted, some backsliders have been reclaimed, and the work still continues to go on. The church is generally well in the work, and we are praying and hoping for a more glorious display of divine power. To God be all the glory.

Yours in Christ,

March 8, 1838.

FOR ZION'S HERALD.

EAST WILLIAMSTOWN CIRCUIT, N. H. CONF.

MR. BROWN—The Lord has been pleased, in the plenitude of his mercy, to visit this circuit of late, with the outpourings of his Holy Spirit. Some 50 or 60 souls have passed, as we trust, from darkness to light, and from the power of Satan to the power of God. This work is principally among the youth, though not exclusively, and has been accomplished mostly by means of protracted meetings, of which we have held two. The first was held in Williamstown, and the second in Brookfield.

We are indebted to several of our brethren in the ministry for assistance at these meetings, especially to the Rev. John Perrin, of the Maine Conference, who now resides at Brookfield, and who with us, superintended the meeting at that place, as I was necessarily absent most of the time. But while we would be grateful for human help, we would be especially thankful for the divine blessing.

J. A. SCARRETT.

March 3, 1838.

FOR ZION'S HERALD.

HARTLAND, VT.

The Lord is with us, the God of Jacob is our refuge. Backsliders are reclaimed, and sinners converted to God. While it is well with us and ours, we do not forget to pray for the poor down-trodden slave in his abject servitude, nor their oppressors.

Yours affectionately,

W. PECK.

FOR ZION'S HERALD.

AN EXCURSION OF PLEASURE.

MR. BROWN—Since at all seasons of the year much anxiety is manifested for "parties of pleasure," it may be very proper to throw out hints with respect to the best mode of conducting them. No farther apology will be deemed necessary, we presume, for noticing briefly a visit to Weston, yesterday, by some thirty of us, including the pastor and some members of each of the M. E. Churches in this city. It originated with one of the brethren who had formerly resided in that village, and had been connected several years with the church in that place. We had indeed anticipated pleasure, but it was by no means that kind of smiling sky and enlivening scenery are essential elements; and hence, although the weather was inauspicious, we found no occasion to defer our visit.

At an early hour in the afternoon, we stopped at the house of worship, where we were met by some of the brethren of the place. We immediately engaged in the exercises of religious worship, and the pastor of the Brookfield St. Church discoursed to us very happily on that "love which worketh no ill to its neighbors." Then followed what may be not unfrequently termed an extemporaneous "love-feast." All were invited to declare what they knew and felt of holy influences, and very few were speechless;—those few from necessity, perhaps, for the time was short. Each one seemed to be conscious of hallowing motives in thus withdrawing from the din and bustle of the city, to sympathize with and encourage the lowly band of disciples of Christ in Weston. Some might have felt at first a little disappointment, but it was only for a moment, and soon the universal sentiment seemed to be, "all is well," and "it is good for us to be here."

The circumstances, the persons present, the place, all seemed to awaken some dear memories in our associations. One found it delightful to be there, for it was in the country that he first found, by blissful experience, that the God of nature is also the God of grace which bringeth salvation. In the venerable and care-worn minister whom we were visiting one of our beloved pastors recognized the instrument of his own father's conversion. Another of our number claimed the spot where we were gathered, as his spiritual birth-place; the church itself as his spiritual mother. This brother will excuse me, I believe, if I record, as nearly as I can recollect, in his own words, a circumstance which happily illustrates the blessedness of Christian effort.

"One evening, when there was a prayer meeting

at my house, the village inn yonder, a gentleman from the city, having put up with me for the night. Though an entire stranger, I felt that I ought to invite him into the room where prayer was to be made, and he assented. A few days afterwards I removed to the city, and was one day accosted in the street by a gentleman whom I did not immediately recognize, but was soon reminded that it was he whom I had introduced to the prayer meeting. "That," he said, "was the first Methodist meeting I ever attended; but I was so favorably impressed, that, upon my return home, I persuaded my wife to go with me to one of your places of worship, when it pleased God to awaken and convert us both; and now we claim you as our brother in church fellowship."

The exercises of the evening were not less interesting and delightful, than those of the afternoon had been. We listened to a very appropriate discourse on "the blessedness of the man who maketh the Lord his trust," by the pastor of the Blossom Street Church, and to several exhortations from other brethren in the ministry. Few were present beside our own party, and a portion of the church in Weston; and to those who walk by sight, every thing looked unimpressive. Still an irresistible desire was felt to see one even, as the harbinger of a revival in the place, "run before," like him of olden time who wished to see Jesus. (The call was given, and while we were "in hope, believing against hope," imagine with what emotions we heard that one, a young man, come forward with resolute step, and in humble penitence kneel at the altar. We thought of the joy in the presence of angels of God over one sinner that repenteth, and we felt that we were permitted to be partakers of that joy. We know not that he has yet rejoiced in the peace of believing, but we can hope that a work has been begun in his own heart and in Weston, which shall be consummated in glory.

At the close of our meeting we solemnly pledged ourselves to remember Weston in prayers, and this pledge was reciprocated by the brethren of the place. May Heaven bless them.

Boston, March 8, 1838.

FOR ZION'S HERALD.

"LAY MEMBERS."

MR. BROWN—I wish to say to your readers, that in a short notice in reply to Dr. Snow, published in the Herald of Feb. 28, not the least disrespect was intended to be shown to our "lay members." All who know me, know that I respect their rights, as much as I do those of the clergy.

It is well known that I advocate the doctrine of *civil rights*, and that I am opposed to *popery* in all its forms. The notion that our lay brethren are inferior to the clergy, is a sentiment which I heartily disapprove, and I am happy to know that it has no existence on our side of the house.

I make these remarks, because it has been hinted that I might be misunderstood, and perhaps misrepresented.

March 10, 1838.

SUFFERINGS OF A HINDOO DEVOTEE.

A missionary thus describes a singular case of self-torture. The devotee was in the act of measuring his way to Juggernaut by his own body. He never rose upon his feet in travelling. When on his knees, he reached his hands forward to the ground, and thus his body onward. Every time he drew himself along thus, he bent his forehead against the ground three times, looking toward the temple, which was in sight.

When I got sufficiently near," said the missionary, "I called to him, but he did not appear to hear what I said, and continued on his way without paying the least attention. I therefore came up, and succeeded in stopping him. A deep melancholy sat visible upon his countenance, his lips moving in prayer to his god, in a low, groaning tone of voice. When I had surveyed him a few moments, he gave over repenting, and I began to converse with him as well as I was able. I first inquired of him how far he had come in that manner. He answered, 'Seven hundred and fifty miles.' 'How long have you been on the way?' 'About eight months.' He appeared about twenty-one years of age, and was so emaciated that his voice was nearly gone. I could not just understand him. I asked him what he expected from his visit to Juggernaut. I was told that he expected almost everything, particularly that thereby he should get rid of his sins. I then told him about Jesus Christ, dying for his sins, and that if he would only believe on Christ, he would immediately find the blessings he sought. He seemed to hear with some attention and surprise. By this time a number of wicked looking Brahmins from a neighboring temple, were gathered around us, and began to encourage him to proceed."

Burder's Missionary Anecdotes.

EARLY METHODISTS OF ILLINOIS.—The gospel of Christ by preaching was first introduced into Illinois, about 1787, by Elder James Smith, a Baptist preacher from Kentucky. His labors were blessed and a number were converted, among whom were Capt. Joseph Ogile, Peter Costertine, Benjamin Ogile, William Murray, with several females and others, who adopted the Methodist views of doctrine, church government, &c.

In 1796, Hosea Riggs, a Methodist exhorter, from Western Pennsylvania, came to Illinois, and formed the above named persons into a class. Mr. Riggs was a revolutionary soldier, became converted and joined the Methodists, when 22 years of age. He still lives in St. Clair county, nearly 80 years old, and quite superannuated. He has been a preacher upwards of half a century. This class was formed at the house of Joseph Ogile, in the American Bottom, now in Monroe county. The next class was organized in Goshen settlement—as the settlement along the bluffs from Canteen creek was called—Riggs, from a neighboring temple, were gathered around us, and began to encourage him to proceed."

Including Wisconsin and some mission stations amongst the Indians of the Upper Mississippi, the Methodists now number about 18,000 members, 70 circuit, and probably 200 local preachers. The Methodist denomination are occupying broad ground on the subject of education in all its departments, from the primary school up to the classical seminary and university.—Pioneer.

FREE INQUIRY.—This is the boast alike of those who cast away the whole or a part of the Bible. A young convert came to us the other day in deep distress, because of the persecutions she endured from her husband. He was taking every means to hinder her from going to the church, where her soul had found peace and joy, and not unfrequently had turned the key of his house against her, when she returned from worshipping God. The Bible he had cast into the flames, and refused to have it replaced. He had been a Universalist, but is now an infidel or follower of Abner Kneeland. The next day, a member of the church came to us with tears in his eyes and a breaking heart, to seek advice. Said she, "I have every thing that I could desire, but one thing. My husband, my poor husband! This is expected to join the church, in a few days, who had in like manner been three years with decision to quit your church, or to quit him." "Is your husband an infidel?" we asked. "He was; but lately, he is loud in the praise of the Universalists. If I would go to the church of Mr. S. (a Universalist preacher) he would be satisfied." And still, the next day, our prayers were asked for a young convert, who is expected to join the church, in a few days, who had in like manner been three years with decision to quit your church, or to quit him."

And this is free inquiry, indeed! And this is what we are to expect, if these kindred spirits, Universalism and infidelity, should triumph!—N. Y. Evan.

ZION'S HERALD.

BOSTON, WEDNESDAY, MARCH 14, 1838.

THE ALTON AFFAIR.

In the Herald of Feb. 21, we inserted a long article from the *New York Commercial Advertiser* relative to the murder at Alton, and relative to Mr. Lovejoy, and expressed, in connection with that article, our dissent from the writer's position and statements, presented as facts. We wish now to call the attention of our readers to some statements made in that communication which need correction.

"In the first place, I have seen the death of Mr. Lovejoy noticed in a number of abolition papers in glowing colors, and with all the characteristics of holy martyrdom, but in none have I seen a single intimation that there could be even the suspicion of wrong on his part."

No less than eight abolition papers have noticed Mr. Lovejoy's death, with not only intimations or suspicions of wrong on his part, but in unequivocal and some of them strong terms of disapprobation. The Liberator has been very severe, and some anti-slavery societies have passed resolutions censuring him for taking a deadly weapon into his hands, and for not adhering to the principle of non-resistance. *Honestus* we presume, must live in some obscure village, or he would have known something about this.

On the contrary, he has been extolled, eulogized, and almost apotheosized. The orator at the Tabernacle declared his martyrdom to that of St. Stephen; nay he declared that he died a "vicarious sacrifice!"—pushing the analogy so far, as to compare his death to the great sacrifice on Calvary!

The orator here spoken of, is Rev. Beriah Green, of Whiteborough, N. Y., President of the Oneida Institute. If *Honestus* has read this comparison and declaration, that discourse, or if he heard it delivered, there can be no room to doubt his statement. We have sent to New York for a copy of the discourse, so that the truth or falsity of this charge, will soon be decided.

"The language of all this," the public, is, that Mr. Lovejoy has done right—his silence under these circumstances would imply this; their *unqualified approval* of his course, and their high eulogium, show that they not only do not condemn, but that they highly commend his course. This, I say, is to me alarming."

This reasoning would answer very well, and would be very forcible, if it were deduced from facts; but we have shown above, that it is not. The writer says that *their silence and unqualified approval* of Mr. Lovejoy's course, meaning the abolitionists, are to him alarming. But the truth is, they have not been silent, nor have they given him their *unqualified approval*. But even then, these charges true, are they more faulty than his up-braidings, who can see nothing in his character to approve, but only to censure? While they charge others with being one-sided, let them be careful that they do not fall into the same error themselves.

"They approve of a Christian and a Christian minister's arming himself and his associates, and shooting down his fellow men."

How unjust and heartless the charge, contained in these few words. Respecting their approval of Mr. Lovejoy's course, we have already said sufficient. The phrase "arming himself and his associates," looks as if the writer intended to convey the idea, that Mr. Lovejoy was the principal agent in this business, and that he actually procured arms and put them into the hands of his friends. But this is not the fact. The writer offers no proof of this. We declare that he neither armed himself or his associates; but that he was acting under the authority of the Mayor of the city. The following is the statement of Rev. Mr. Groves, a Presbyterian clergyman of Alton. We extract it from a letter written by him to the editor of the *New York Observer*.

"The history of the matter is this: A few days previous, at the suggestion of the Mayor, a volunteer company of some 50 or 60 men was got up, and organized, to act in any emergency under the civil authorities, for the preservation of peace in the city. About 50 of this company spent the forepart of the evening of the 10th, in regular military exercises in the same building in which the press was deposited. About nine o'clock, they dispersed, leaving only twelve men, who were in the opinion of the whole company, amply sufficient, to defend the press against any attack, which a mob might bring against them. [The Mayor was consulted, and all the plans arranged and directed with his approbation.]"

Mr. Gilman, one of the owners of the building in which the press was stored, says in one of his communications, "I assured them that we would not deliver it [the press]—that we had been told by the Mayor to protect our property, and that we would do so with our lives."

The *Alton Telegraph* of Jan. 24th, which gives an account of the trial of the rioters, states, that it was made to appear by evidence, that there was an agreement among those in the building, not to resort to fire-arms, unless driven to it in the preservation of their lives; and that they all supposed they were acting under the authority of the Mayor.

In addition to this, Mr. Owen Lovejoy, brother of the deceased, in a letter to the editor of the *Emancipator*, and published in that paper of Jan. 11, says,

"On the night of the 7th of November, the Mayor went into the building, and was asked by those within if they were right in defending their property and lives. He said 'yes, perfectly right, the law sanctions and justifies your doing so.'"

So much for a Christian minister's "arming himself and his associates," and now what proof is there that he shot down his fellow man? Does *Honestus* charge a Christian minister with murder and yet offer no evidence of it? How could he do this in the face of the frequent declarations which have been made in Anti-Slavery papers, that Mr. Lovejoy did not fire at all—that he was not in the room, whence the fire proceeded? This declaration has been made by the surviving company; and who but they could know whether Mr. Lovejoy fired, or not? Could those outside know anything about this, especially as the season was that of night? A young man, one of Mr. Lovejoy's printers, says,

"It is a fact that at least two guns were fired into the building, before any gun was fired from it. A consultation was then held by a portion of the persons inside, and it was determined to fire upon the mob. Accordingly two or three guns were fired at the same time. Which of them took effect is unknown, but the assailed party said that a wounded man was taken away by his confederates. MR. LOVEJOY WAS NOT IN THE CHAMBER, FROM WHICH THE GUNS WERE FIRED UPON THE MOB."

Honestus says—

"The course Mr. L. pursued, is calculated very obviously to give character and currency to the mob principle."

"But what was the case of Mr. Lovejoy? It does not appear that he ever made any attempt to defend himself by the law. Did he prosecute the rioters when his former presses were destroyed?"

Well, suppose he did not make "any attempt to defend himself by the law." Is this to be brought against him as a charge? Have not some good men in all ages, suffered persecution and abuse, who did not go to law about it, while others have? The destruction of his press, the first time, was in consequence of his publishing an account of the dedication of the Roman Catholic Cathedral at St. Louis, at which companies of soldiers marched into the house on the Sabbath, with life and drum, and cannons were discharged! He did not prosecute at this time,

but published an appeal to the citizens, which was successful, and he was protected. Suppose he had prosecuted in either of these cases, does *Honestus* believe he would have obtained a verdict? Does he not know that it is very difficult to convict in the case of rioters? Look at the late trial of the Alton rioters, every one of whom was cleared.

"Did he in the present case, apply for a legal defence? Or did he not rather deliberately arm himself and his friends, and take the defence of his own hands?" It was a case, too, not of sudden and unexpected assault, but one in which he had ample time to make his arrangements, and obtain legal protection, if that was necessary and possible; if not necessary, there was no need of his arming himself and friends;—and in doing so, he only held out a kind of challenge, which of itself, in an excited state of the public mind, was calculated to gather a mob and provoke an attack. It was necessary, and could have been obtained, then, to take another course, and assume the defence without a legal provision, was to make private judgment and the will of the party interested, the rule of action, in a case where the exigency did not require it, and this is the very essence of the mob principle. Now, as before stated, it does not appear, either from the Mayor's account, or from any other quarter, that such application was made, and therefore Mr. L. had no right to assume that such aid would not be afforded him.

He did in the present case apply for a legal defence, many times. Where has the law been? He has not seen this declaration repeatedly made? Hear what Owen Lovejoy says on this point, in the letter before mentioned.

"I see in the last Evangelist a remark expressing regret that my brother had not made a formal demand of the Mayor for protection of life and property, before any individual efforts were made for that purpose. But, my dear sir, not only did I not make such a demand, but I never promised, which were never kept. On Monday the 6th, on the night of which the press arrived, Mr. Gilman and my brother went to the Mayor, and requested the expected arrival of the press, and the threats of violence, and requested that special constables might be appointed; which request was laid before the Common Council in their action, and the only response that it received from that body, was a resolution advising Mr. L. and all his friends not to bring any abolition presses to Alton; and all the prevented it from passing, and being recorded on the books, was the refusal of the Mayor to sign it, he refusing to do so, and saying that it was not an answer to the request laid before them. This I have from Mr. May's request, and of course it can be depended upon as true."

The reader will perceive, that the fine reasoning in the extract above, is wholly based upon false assumption, and therefore, comes tumbling to the ground.

"The course of Mr. Lovejoy and his friends, whether they be his immediate coadjutors, or his unqualified abettors, is contributing, in my opinion, to the fostering of the very spirit and principles which they so justly condemn. If, then, we would put down mobs, we must dispense of Mr. L.'s course."

So the writer might say with regard to every mob made by physical force to acquire independence, or to defend rights. If Washington, in the American Revolution had been unsuccessful, and had been taken by the British, and hung as a rebel, this writer might say the same propriety have said. "If then we would put down rebellion, we must disapprove of Gen. Washington's course." The writer might also adduce the case of Wesley and Whitefield with the same propriety. It was a very common thing for these ministers to be mobbed, and these mobs were encouraged by men who very graciously admitted that mobs were bad things, but in the same breath, denounced in bitter terms, these men of God, as disorganizers, and warned the community, that if they would put down mobs, they must disapprove of Mr. Wesley's and Mr. Whitefield's course.

"It may not be pleaded to avoid this, that he was a citizen, and defending his political rights. Christ says, 'My kingdom is not of this world; if my kingdom were of this world, then would my servants fight, that I should not be delivered to the Jews.' Did Mr. L. think with his master? It seems not. If this was a question of political and constitutional rights, why was a minister of the Gospel in the prosecution of his high vocation, engaged in it?"

Why do ministers of the gospel go as chaplains in the army and navy? Although they do not bear arms, yet, what is the difference? They aid, countenance and abet, and even pray that those who do bear them, may be successful in shooting down their fellow-men, and sending them suddenly into the presence of their Maker! What is the difference? Is it any nearer right for twenty men to fight, than two men? Beside, if it is right to fight at all, Christians, of all men are the most suitable for it. We regret that Mr. Lovejoy ever took a musket into his hands; but if ever any one had a right to do it, he had, under the circumstances in which he was placed, and if ever a man could be justified in so doing, he can be.

"Did the Apostle Peter, or Paul, or John ever defend themselves against a mob, by deadly weapons?"

What does *Honestus* think of Paul's journey from Jerusalem to Caesarea, under escort of two hundred soldiers, seventy horsemen, and two hundred spearmen? If Paul had conscientious scruples about their being employed with deadly weapons in their hands, to defend his person, why did he not decline going with them? Suppose on their way, the mob of forty men who had laid an oath that they would neither eat or drink till they had killed Paul, had intercepted them, joined by many others who were nearly as hostile, but who had not taken the oath, and had given the company fight? Could Paul have been justified in joining his associates in defending his own life? Suppose the captain of this company of two hundred soldiers, seventy horsemen, and two hundred spearmen, had authorized, and even commanded Paul to take a deadly weapon into his hands, and assist in defending his own life; would it have been right for him to do it, or should he say, "No, it is right for you to defend my life by deadly weapons, but it is not right for me to do it."

"I have written the above as though Mr. Lovejoy was the moving and controlling agent in this affair, and so it must be understood. If he was advised to it by others, and if, as has been intimated, those advisers were, or are of men, Christian ministers, it only shows that this course is the more alarming, because it has an extended ministerial patronage. Besides, Mr. L.'s whole course shows that his was the spirit for such an affair."

That is, his spirit was that of a murderer. This is fairly deducible from the language, for the writer has charged him repeatedly with unlawfully shooting down his fellow-men! What a hostile spirit toward a departed brother, whose character is represented by those who best knew him, as one of great purity, and of deep piety. A gentleman of Northampton, who addresses a letter to Mr. Channing, through the Hampshire Republican says, "Dr. Channing, through the Hampshire Republican says, 'The whole tone of his paper was that of deep conviction of the holiness of God's law. No man evinced more enlargedness of mind, or more purity of motive.'"

The Presbytery of Alton, at its session in November last, passed the following among other resolutions:—Resolved, That all glowing, prayerfulness, firmness of principle and above all, glowing sympathy with the oppressed, which our deceased brother manifested, entitle his memory to our deep veneration and lasting regard."

